Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

98 1858 MAY 18 1999

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

CASE NUMBER
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER, 1998 TERM

DONNA MARIE BETTS, PETITIONER

VS.

CONTAINER CORPORATION OF AMERICA AND ITS AGENTS, SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS, RESPONDENTS

ON APPEAL TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT, CASE NUMBERS: 98-4076 AND 98-2513 (CONSOLIDATED)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

DONNA MARIE BETTS, PRO SE
7339 S. RACINE AVENUE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60636-4111
773-783-0018

9PP

1. ARE THE PROCEDURES OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT IN CASE 94 CV 242, IN THEIR ENTIRETY, AND THE PROCEDURES OF THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS UPON RELATED MATTERS WHICH CAME BEFORE SUCH COURT SUBSEQUENT TO U.S. DISTRICT COURT PROCEDURES LEGALLY VALID IN THAT JUDGE PLUNKETT DETERMINED THAT ILLINOIS LAWS GOVERN THIS DISPUTE (APPENDIX WITH THIS PETITION AT PAGE 20) BUT SUCH GOVERNING LAWS ARE NOT THE BASIS APPLIED TO DETERMINE MY LEGAL RIGHTS TO REMEDIES AND RELIEFS (APPENDIX WITH THIS PETITION AT PAGES 1, 3, 7, 13)?

2. WAS IT PROPER FOR THE LOWER COURTS TO REFUSE TO ENFORCE THE UNREPUDIATED AND RATIFIED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS?

(S.CT. RULE 14.1(A)).

AGENTS OF THE RESPONDENT ARE:
MR. JAMES FRICK
MR. CHARLES WHALEN
MS. RUBY SMITH
MS. MARY THORKELSON
MR. MICHAEL WEINBAUM -
HOAGLAND, FITZGERALD, SMITH &
PRANAITIS
WINSTON & STRAWN
SCHUYLER, ROCHE
GARDNER, CARTON & DOUGLAS

THE PARENT COMPANIES ARE MOBIL CORPORATION AND CURRENTLY, JEFFERSON SMURFIT CORPORATION AS CURRENTLY OWNED BY SMURFIT-STONE CORPORATION. (S.CT. RULE 14.1(B)).

TABLE OF CONTENTS AND AUTHORITIES

QUESTIONS (RULE 14.1(A)) AT I
LIST (RULE 14.1(B) AT II
TABLE OF CONTENTS (RULE 14.1(C) AT II
REPORTS (RULE 14.1(D)) AT IV

Basis of Jurisdiction (Rule 14.1(e))
at iv
Authorities (Rule 14.1(f)) at iv
Statement of Case (Rule 14.1(g))
at v
Basis of Appeals Jurisdiction (Rule
14.1(g)(ii) at 2
Argument (Rule 14.1(h)) at 3
Wallace v. Human Rights Commission,
633 N.E.2d 851 (Ill.App. 1 Dist.
1994) at page iv and v;
29 C.F.R. §1601.21(e) et seq. at
pages iv and 2, Appen. at pages 24-25;
56 Illinois Administrative Code,
§§5300.480 at page 1, Appen. at page
26; and 5300.490 at page 1, Appen.
at page 26;
Illinois Code of Civil Procedure,
§2-610 et seq. Appen. at page 27;
Illinois Human Rights Act §2-102,
Appen. at page 28;
§6-101 Appen. at page 28;
§8A-104 Appen. at pages 29-32;
28 USC:
§1254(1) at pages iv and v, Appen.
at 33;
§1331 at pages v and 3, Appen. at
33;

§1332 AT PAGES V AND 3, APPEN. AT 33;
§1343 AT PAGES V AND 3, APPEN. AT PAGE 34;
§1345 AT PAGES V AND 3, APPEN. AT PAGE 35
APPENDIX (S.CT. RULE 14.1(I)) UNDER SEPARATE COVER
(S.CT. RULE 14.1(C)).

U.S.C.A. ORDER OF FEB. 25, 1999
U.S.D.C. ORDER OF APRIL 1, 1998
U.S.C.A. ORDER OF MAY 7, 1997
U.S.D.C. ORDER OF DECEMBER 19, 1994
IHRC ORDERS OF APRIL 29, 1988
IHRC ORDER OF JUNE 29, 1992
(S.CT. RULE 14.1(D))

FEBRUARY 25, 1999 **(S.CT. RULE 14.1(E)(I)).**

28 USC §1254(1) **(S.CT. RULE 14.1(E)(IV)).**

WALLACE V. HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION, 633 N.E.2D 851 (ILL.APP. 1 DIST. 1994);
29 C.F.R. §1601.21(E) ET SEQ.;

56 Illinois Administrative Code,
§§5300.480 and 5300.490;
Illinois Code of Civil Procedure,
§2-610 et seq.;
Illinois Human Rights Act §2-102;
§6-101 and §8A-104;
28 USC:
§1254; §1331; §1332; §1343; §1345.

(S.Ct. Rule 14.1(f))

It is submitted that Judge Plunkett, in Case 94 CV 242, determined that Illinois laws govern this dispute (Appendix with this Petition at page 20). It is submitted that my exclusive remedies regarding my charges are established pursuant to Illinois case law contained in Wallace v. Human Rights Commission, 633 N.E.2d 851 (Ill.App. 1 Dist. 1994). It is submitted that neither of the lower federal courts applied governing Illinois laws to the entire record of facts (See record of litigation from 1985 to date, S.Ct. Rule 12.7) to determine my

LEGAL RIGHTS TO REMEDIES AND RELIEFS (APPENDIX WITH THIS PETITION AT PAGES 1-21). IT IS SUBMITTED THAT THE ILLINOIS PROVISIONS OF LAW AT PAGES 26 THROUGH 32 OF THE APPENDIX FILED WITH THIS PETITION ARE THE GOVERNING ILLINOIS LAWS WHICH ARE REQUIRED TO DETERMINE THIS DISPUTE AS NOT APPLIED.

IT IS SUBMITTED THAT THE RECORD OF LITIGATION SHOWS THAT SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS WERE RATIFIED AND UNREPUDIATED (SEE APPEAL 95-1064, REF. 704286-1, APPENDIX EXHS. 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 62 AND CASE REC. DOC. 86 EXH. 18, S.CT. RULE 12.7 AND APPENDIX WITH THIS PETITION AT PAGES 36-37).

IT IS SUBMITTED THAT THE ILLINOIS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION HAS NOT COMPLIED WITH 56 ILLINOIS ADMINISTRATIVE CODE §§5300.480 AND IS IN VIOLATION OF 5300.490 (APPENDIX WITH THIS PETITION AT PAGE 26), IN REGARD TO EACH OF MY RELATED ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS (SEE CASE

Rec. Docs. 108 and 109 and Appeal 95-1064 Ref. 704286-1 Exhs. 19 and 20, S.Ct. Rule 12.7). It is submitted that because the Illinois Human Rights Commission is not in compliance with governing Illinois laws, the E.E.O.C. proceeded improperly to issue notices of right to sue and a determination to me in regard to each of my civil rights matters as it is submitted that the E.E.O.C. is required to comply with 29 C.F.R. §1601.21(e) et seq. (Appendix with this Petition at pages 24 and 25 and See Ref. 704286-1 Exhs. 21, 22, 51, S.Ct. Rule 12.7).

In that it is submitted that the E.E.O.C. proceeded improperly, the U.S. District Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals, in reliance upon procedures of the EEOC, are submitted to have proceeded entirely without jurisdiction to enter determinations of my legal rights.
(S.Ct. Rule 14.1(g)).

Original jurisdiction to hear my complaints before the U.S. District Court is submitted to be conveyed

BY 28 U.S.C. §§1331, 1332, 1343, AND 1345 (APPENDIX WITH THIS PETITION AT PAGES 33-35) (S.CT. RULE 14.1(G)(II)).

IT IS SUBMITTED THAT LACK OF JURISDICTION IS A SUFFICIENT REASON TO VOID THE PROCEDURES OF THE LOWER FEDERAL COURTS. IT IS FURTHER SUBMITTED THAT, IN THAT ILLINOIS LAWS ARE GOVERNING, THE PROCEDURES OF THE LOWER FEDERAL COURTS ARE ENTERED WITHOUT APPLICATION OF THE GOVERNING LAW AND, THEREFORE, BELIEVED AND SUBMITTED TO BE VOID AS DEPARTURES FROM THE STANDARDS OF CASE AND STATUTORY LAWS ASSERTED IN THE COURSE OF LITIGATION, (SEE RECORD OF LITIGATION FROM 1985 TO DATE, S.CT. RULE 12.7) (S.CT. RULE 14.1(H)).

WHEREFORE, I RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THE SUPREME COURT TO GRANT THE ISSUANCE OF A WRIT OF CERTIORARI AS IT IS SUBMITTED THAT I WAS NOT MADE ENTIRELY AND COMPLETELY WHOLE IN REGARD TO EACH ADMITTED MATERIAL

FACT CONTAINED IN THE RECORD OF LITIGATION FROM 1985 TO DATE (SEE RECORD OF LITIGATION IN ITS ENTIRETY, S.CT. RULE 12.7).

Donna M. Betts

DONNA M. BETTS, PETITIONER
7339 S. RACINE AVENUE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60636
773-783-0018